



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

each case a *y* is found in the syllable preceding.¹² One of the most ingenious suggestions in the book is *p'ydr̥es* 'bowls, vessels,' Vulgate *hydria*, for the difficult *p̥ede* (1717). Here, as elsewhere, Gollancz is careful to state precisely how the corruption of the text may have come about.

This review has naturally emphasized the points in which I dissent from Professor Gollancz, but I have not undertaken to discuss the differences, which are many, in the general plan and scope of his edition and my own. In spite of the fact that Professor Gollancz has solved, or at least brought us nearer the solution of, many cruces in *Purity*, fascinating problems of textual interpretation still remain. It is to be hoped that the appearance of two new editions of a poem long unduly neglected will direct attention not only to these problems, but to the importance of *Purity* in its relationship to the other poems of the alliterative school.

ROBERT J. MENNER.

Yale University.

Das dichterische Kunstwerk. Grundbegriffe der Urteilsbildung in der Literaturgeschichte von E. ERMATINGER. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner, 1921. viii + 405 pp.

What principles shall guide us in estimating the poet and his work? Such is the main question proposed in this book. As between two prevalent methods, the one historical, objective, and descriptive (tending to formalism), the other subjective and philosophical (tending to caprice), the author believes *in der Mitten liegt holdes Bescheiden*. While the critic should not be dominated by an ideal of abstract verity (unattainable anyway), he must have a sense of responsibility, appealing to his scientific and his social conscience.

The first distinction is between *Welt* and *Ich*. By *Welt* is meant not *Ding an sich* (excluded from the discussion as unknowable), but a sort of *Gesamtich*, a conventionalized ego, formed by tradi-

¹² But Emerson (*Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xxxvii, 58 f.) cites many examples from this manuscript which seem to show that this representation of final unstressed *e* reflects confusion in the language itself.

tion. The varying conflict between these two forces is termed *Erleben*, and is the source of the poet's dynamic and vital idea, his *Weltanschauung*, which expresses itself in symbolic forms, his particular works. Thus at the outset naturalism and impressionism are condemned on principle, and the creative sovereignty of the poet is asserted.

The interplay of these forces (*Ich*, as feeling, sensation, will; and convention, as understanding, roughly speaking) results in *imagination*, which is a creator of new values. And the intensity of the conflict measures the creative power of any individual. Also the varying participation and energy of these elements in the struggle seem to the author to furnish fundamental distinctions between epic, lyric, and dramatic poets. He too readily finds agreement of certain examples with his theoretical views, and does not avoid the seductive fallacy of reasoning from a particular to a general. Mörike was indeed *passive* (though his writing poetry in bed does not prove it!), but Goethe, greatest of lyric poets, was not. And certainly the author should be more sceptical of his own reasoning than to commit himself to the assertion (p. 25), that, compared with epic poets, dramatists, because of the intenser conflict in them between *Ich* and *Welt*, *seldom grow old*. Virgil lived to be 51, Dante 56, Racine 60, Aeschylus 69 (and died by accident), Euripides 74, Corneille 78, Ibsen 78, Calderon 81, Grillparzer 81, Sophocles 90. In the same way Keller as calm, cool materialist, is made too exclusively the type of the epic poet. What about Dante? Dostoevsky? Accidental personal qualities are here confounded with the characteristics of *genre*.

More convincing is the discussion of the creative experience (*künstlerisches Erleben*). Philosophy is considered an aid to the poet in finding himself, striking examples being Keller, Kleist, and Hölderlin. Rejecting the milieu theory as impersonal and uncreative, the author affirms the unique and dynamic force of the creative spirit, and proceeds to set up the reach of experience, its intensity, and its degree of faith (as opposed to *Wissen*) as proper tests of genius. Goethe's reach, for example, is large, Storm's narrow. Schiller's dynamic ideas are limited chiefly to the conflict between realism and idealism, and no idea at all is manifest in his later works, from *Maria Stuart* on (p. 116), these plays being condemned as technical feats. (This view, for *Maria*

Stuart, at least, is contradicted by the author on p. 163). Absence of ideas characterizes journalistic and naturalistic writers, who employ a (spurious) principle of organization in certain scientific "truths" not born of their own experience.

The poet's dynamic idea symbolizes itself in material form, whence there must also be a *Stofferlebnis*. Here are considered the sources of material, and the relation of idea to material. Subjects may be invented, or else discovered (in present reality, in tradition, in the works of other poets). Invention is held to be least satisfactory, because the imagination of the individual must be poor compared with that of a people. This point of view leads the author to a pretty sweeping condemnation of modern drama since Hebbel. Of course the subject-matter is nothing in itself but only in relation to the creative mind of the poet. The subject is not "chosen" by the poet, but finds itself by a kind of pre-established harmony with the dynamic idea. In the finished work there is no subject (*Motiv*) distinguishable from idea, or vice versa. Indeed the very mental processes of the poet are symbolic, *sein Anschauen zugleich ein Denken, sein Denken ein Anschauen. . . . Nur der Dichter denkt symbolisch, im Stoff die Idee, mit der Idee den Stoff* (p. 57).

With most of this we can readily agree. The author then proceeds further to characterize epic, lyric, and dramatic poets by means of their *Stofferlebnis*. In the lyric experience everything is inward; there is no conflict, no real use of time and place, which here have only emotional values. In the dramatic material there must be implied a conflict adequate to the poet's ideal dualism, a demand which, needless to say, denies the static drama of naturalism. Epic material is more contemplative; in general it is incident rather than action, *schicksals-*, not *willensbestimmt*. Again the author is inclined to overstate his case. The *Nibelungen* material, for example, is both epic and dramatic, and Hebbel considered the author of the *Nibelungenlied* to be a "dramatist from head to foot." *Crime and Punishment* deals with the same basic problem as *Macbeth*. Nor is dramatic action always *willensbestimmt* (*Oedipus Rex*). It is too easy to attach abstract value to practical distinctions.

About half the book is concerned with *Formerlebnis*. Here the discussion turns on inner and outer form. Inner form seems

at bottom to be the same as *Gedankenerlebnis* (*Weltanschauung, Ideendynamik*). At any rate it is just this spiritual trend of the poet active in a particular work. It shows itself in three ways: as a peculiar atmosphere, as inner motivation, and as symbolic meaning. Under the first of these divisions are managed unobtrusively such difficult categories as comedy, tragedy, humor, the interesting section on tragedy resting firmly on Hegel. Inner motivation is unity of perspective, exemplified in detail by *Der Prinz von Homburg*. Particularly interesting is the explanation of rhythm in lyric poetry as a manifestation of this inner motivation. Perhaps the most important question asked in connection with inner form is, how we are to estimate the moral judgments approved by the poet in his work. In answer the author denies first the existence of any truth in an absolute sense in poetry (p. 270). But he definitely restricts this statement by taking refuge with Hegel's distinction between temporal moral conceptions and *Vernunft als sittliche Gesetzmässigkeit der Welt*. He finds that the history of literature confirms the philosopher, and that there are recognizable certain *letzte und allgemeinste Sittenbegriffe* common to all great poets. Some of these are specified: Sanctity of life, Truth, Love, Fidelity, Reverence (p. 272).

All the elements implicit in inner form affect the outer form, or style. The determining quality of outer form, compared with inner, is the "effect," or the consideration of the public. *Künstlerisch formen heisst letzten Endes die Gesichte des Innern in äussere Bildhaftigkeit wandeln, Unsichtbares sichtbar allen Blicken ausstellen* (p. 308). However carefully the author guards against any artificial conception of style, the sentence quoted illustrates the difficulty of making a clear distinction between inner and outer form, between *Gesichte des Innern* and *äussere Bildhaftigkeit*. In what sense can the most inner *vision* be *invisible*? The idea that the external situation (public) determines outer form is made the basis for distinguishing style in epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry. Here again some doubtful assertions are made. For example, the proposition that the lyric poet, more than the epic or the dramatic poet, strives for a clear, firm outer form (p. 314) is unprovable, if not meaningless. How valid also is the demand that the language of lyric poetry should avoid "jede Individualisierung durch bestimmte Beiwörter?" A few favorable examples are quoted to

show that lyric poetry *can* be written without such adjectives, and one poem of Arno Holz is held to prove the obverse. The poem, however, is bad for other reasons, and it would be very easy to cite good lyrics with *bestimmte Beiwörter*. Another overstatement of the truth is asserting that the language of lyric poetry is *Präsens und nur das Präsens*. It is generally, but not always: "Ich *ging* im Walde," "Es *schlug* mein Herz," "Ich *sah* des Sommers letzte Rose stehn."

In his characterization of epic style the author lays emphasis on the easygoing tempo, and the fullness of detail in the classical models, contrasted with the quicker movement of modern realism. His position is conservative. In the tendency to make the persons in the story represent themselves (as in drama) he sees the dissolution of epic form. True epic style is held to be a fine balance between *Bericht* and *Darstellung*. This section closes with an interesting discussion of language and rhythm in epic prose.

Style, or outer form, in the drama is determined by the fact that drama is intense conflict of opposing forces. "Static" drama is none. There must be action, and the action must be progressive, without a lapse. A concise and instructive comparison is given between the two types of action: *fortschreitende Handlung* and *rückgreifende Handlung*. A true explanation of the function of the latter, however, it seems to me is not advanced. The *rückgreifende Handlung* (as in *Ghosts*, for example) is employed in modern drama to solve the problem of combining character evolution with practicable unity of time and place, and it originated with Hebbel.¹ Needless to repeat, there is in the author's dramaturgy no room for the drama of naturalism, which he condemns for essentially the same reason as Bartels, Bytkowski, and others. The extent of his conservatism (or is it proper now to call it radicalism?) is seen in his defence of the monologue.

A refreshing feature of this treatise is its stout defense of the autonomy of literature. Psychology, not to mention psychiatry, is not considered the right key to the store-house of literary genius, while the classification of poets according to the subject matter, or even the philosophy of their works, is held to be extraneous to a true science of literature.

¹ Proof of this statement I hope to furnish elsewhere.

This book is derived by thorough scholarship from the best classical and realistic traditions of German literature. It will be helpful to the critic who reads it critically, and does not follow the author into such extremes as condemning poets he does not like by his system (Heine, and Hauptmann, works like *Der Ketzer von Soana* and *Der Narr in Christo* being implicitly at least classified as naturalistic). The reviewer regrets that space is lacking in which to point out its solid qualities more fully, and at the same time better to qualify his own occasional objections.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy with Special Reference to the Liturgic Drama. By NEIL C. BROOKS. [University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. VII, No. 2.] Urbana, 1921. 110 pp.

This study, as its title suggests, contains material of interest both to students of Christian archeology and to students of the liturgical plays. The author states, however, that it is an outgrowth of his own interest in the latter field and "is to be viewed primarily as an attempt to enlarge our knowledge of the *mise en scène* of the liturgical Easter plays" (p. 8). It thus supplements Professor Karl Young's discussion of *The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre* (Madison, 1920) where there is no detailed consideration of the sepulchre itself, and investigates a subject much less exhaustively treated in Dr. J. K. Bonnell's article on *The Easter Sepulchrum in its Relation to the Architecture of the High Altar* (*PMLA*. xxxi, 1916, pp. 664 ff.).

Professor Brooks begins at the beginning—with such accounts of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem as have survived. He shows that the sixth and seventh century representations of the tomb of Christ in Syro-Palestinian art strikingly agree with the descriptions of early pilgrims and probably portray the Holy Sepulchre as it was in the time of Constantine, that is, a quadrangular structure completed by a sort of ciborium. In the medieval Byzantine representations, on the other hand, the tomb is variously portrayed